



California Association of  
Competitive Telecommunications Companies

Communications, Commerce, Community

April 11, 2017

Via ECFS

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**Re: Notice of Ex Parte**

***MB Docket No. 17-91: Petition of the Multifamily Broadband Council Seeking Preemption of Article 52 of the San Francisco Police Code; WC Docket No. 17-84, In the Matter of Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment***

Dear Ms. Dortch,

On behalf of its members, the California Association of Competitive Telecommunications Companies (CALTEL) writes in support of the Motion for an Extension of Time filed in WC Docket No. 17-91<sup>1</sup> by the City and County of San Francisco (San Francisco).<sup>2</sup> San Francisco's motion requests an extension of the comment and reply comment windows for the Public Notice released on April 4, 2017.<sup>3</sup> CALTEL's member companies have benefitted from San Francisco's ordinance, and the requested extensions would greatly enhance CALTEL's ability to contribute more comprehensive comments, including declarations from individual member company representatives, to the record of this proceeding.

CALTEL is a non-profit trade association working to advance the interests of fair and open competition and customer-focused service in California telecommunications. CALTEL members are competitive local exchange carriers (CLECs) that provide voice and broadband services to residential and business customers in California.<sup>4</sup> Although the Multifamily Broadband Council's (MBC's) petition noticeably failed to mention CALTEL's role in the adoption of Article 52, I as well as CALTEL's Co-Chair Dane Jasper, CEO of Sonic Telecom, testified in support of its adoption before the San

---

<sup>1</sup> *Petition of the Multifamily Broadband Council Seeking Preemption of Article 52 of the San Francisco Police Code*, MB Docket No. 17-91 (MBC Petition).

<sup>2</sup> Motion for an Extension of Time, the City and County of San Francisco, MB Docket No. 17-91 (filed April 7, 2017).

<sup>3</sup> DA 17-318.

<sup>4</sup> A list of all members of CALTEL can be found at <http://www.caltel.org/members2.html>.



Francisco Budget and Finance Committee on November 30, 2016. CALTEL categorically disputes MBC's characterizations of the ordinance as favoring large companies over "small, entrepreneurial start-ups"<sup>5</sup> and creating a barrier to competition, broadband deployment, and competitive choice.

In its motion, San Francisco notes the Commission's history of extending comment and reply comment deadlines where doing so would further the establishment of a robust record. CALTEL agrees with San Francisco that the issues raised in MBC's petition are complex and will require significant research to address. CALTEL also intends to prepare and include declarations from individual member companies regarding the competitive benefits of Article 52 on current deployment of fiber-to-the-premise (FTTP) voice-and-broadband services in the city. Finally, because CALTEL's outside counsel is currently traveling out of the country until several days prior to the current May 4, 2017 deadline, additional time would greatly enhance CALTEL's ability to adequately describe how the petition, if granted, would negatively impact competition, broadband deployment and customer choice in San Francisco.

Respectfully submitted,

By: \_\_\_\_\_/S/\_\_\_\_\_  
Sarah DeYoung

Sarah DeYoung  
Executive Director – CALTEL

---

<sup>5</sup> MBC Petition at p. ii.